for internal use only

RESEARCH REPORT

PUBLIC AWARENESS AND ATTITUDES ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES FOCUS GROUPS AND IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

PREPARED FOR:

ENVIRONMENT CANADA

PREPARED BY:

THOMPSON LIGHTSTONE & COMPANY LIMITED

TL # 24389

93-01987/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE NUMBER
1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	7
3.0	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	8
4.0	DETAILED FINDINGS	11
4.1	Focus Groups	11
4.1.1	Importance of the Environment as an Issue	11
4.1.2	Readiness for Action	14
4.1.3	The Environment As An Issue	14
4.1.4	Concerns With Specific Environment Issues	15
4.1.5	Awareness of Government Action on the Environment	15
4.1.6	Perceived Responsibility for Environmental Problem	17
4.1.7	Perceived Responsibility for the Solution	18
4.1.8	Steps Canadians Are Willing to Take	18
4.2	The Average Canadian's Environmental Agenda	21
4.2.1	Tripartite Initiative	21
4.2.2	Education and Communication	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			PAGE NUMBER
	4.2.3	Convenient Programs	24
	4.2.4	Legislation and Enforcement	26
	4.2.5	The Federal Government as an Example	28
	4.2.6	Task Force and Environmental Monitoring	28
	4.2.7	Research and Development	29
	4.2.8	International Aspects	30
4.3	Regional Differences		31
4.4	In-Depth Interviews		33
	4.4.1	Mr. Don Gamble, Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences	33
	4.4.2	Business Council on National Issues	39
	4.4.3	Ms. Betsy Clarke, The Canadian 4H Council	44
	4.4.4	Mr. Dave Bennett, Canadian Labour Congress	45
	4.4.5	The Canadian Petroleum Association	49
	4.4.6	Two Interviews With Representatives of the Pulp and Paper Industry	50

APPENDIX A: Moderator's Discussion Guide; Elite Interview Discussion Guide

APPENDIX B: Focus Group Recruitment Screener

SECTION 1.0

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Focus Groups (The Public)

Canadians are ready for strong leadership and tough measures on the environment, and they look to the Federal Government to provide this leadership. Focus group members outlined some very specific requirements they have for initiatives that should be included in the proposed Environmental Agenda.

Depth of Concern

Canadians care very deeply about the environment. The values which underlie their concerns are survival of the species, the future of our children, and loss of future enjoyment of the environment. The threat is not thought to be an immediate one. The perception is that environmental damage can still be repaired. Group members repeatedly expressed the belief that the time to act is now. Feelings associated with environmental problems range from complacency to outrage. Because the issue is complex and intangible, a feeling of personal powerlessness arises.

Convenience and Universal Access to Programs

There would for example, be resistance at this early stage to giving up the convenience associated with the use of cars; this may be acceptable further into the process. Canadians will use public transit and car pools more if everyone has to, (and they know why), and if they have convenient access to transit facilities. However, recent Via cuts have given the message that the government is not serious about expanding public transit options.

Taxed to the Limit

In addition, although previous research had indicated Canadians are willing to pay more at the pump for an environmental clean-up fund, that willingness has been eroded by the GST. They feel they are already taxed to the limit, and that the necessary funds could be found if the government rearranges its priorities.

Action Now

Now is the time to act. Over the past several months, environmental awareness has been growing, largely as a result of the media. Several focus group members referred to a "critical mass" and a "readiness for action" having been created. Environment was among the top three concerns of all groups, with six other issues of concern directly depending on what was in the news at the time the groups were convened. (i.e. GST, Meech Lake, Abortion).

Government too Soft

Governments are seen as soft on the environment because of their reliance on industry to provide jobs and political support. The perception is that little has been done about the environment since it first became an issue 20 years ago. Group members at times expressed the opinion that a government environmental program would in all likelihood be a cosmetic quick fix; an attempt to give the appearance of doing something without actually dealing with the problem.

Tell Us What We Can Do

Canadians recognize that they are part of the problem, and would like the government to tell them what they can do to be better environmental citizens, over and above what they are currently doing by way of recycling garbage and buying environmentally safe products.

Convenience and Universal Application of Program

Canadians have the will to make some sacrifices, and take the first easy steps to protect the Environment (e.g. Blue Box Program); what they lack is the impetus to take additional steps that a strong Federal initiative would provide.

There would for example, be resistance at this early stage to giving up the convenience associated with the use of cars; this may be acceptable further into the process. Canadians will use public transit and car pools more if everyone has to, (and they know why), and if they have convenient access to transit facilities. However, recent Via cuts have given the message that the government is not serious about expanding public transit options.

The Environmental Agenda

Highlights of Focus Group Findings

- All focus groups called for awareness and education on environmental issues by way of mass media campaigns and school programs similar to those which have resulted in children influencing their parents to quit smoking.

- Focus group members called for a three-way partnership that would include industry, the federal and provincial governments, and the average citizen. The environment is not viewed as a problem that can be effectively dealt with by one group working in isolation. Canadians want the Federal Government to be a model environmental citizen, particularly in the area of the large volume of paper generated by government. Government contractors, it is thought, should be required to pass an environmental audit.

- Convenient programs are needed, similar to the Blue Box recycling program. Convenience is the key to the acceptance and success of any environment initiative directed at the public. This is particularly true due to the time pressures of dual career families. Such programs should offer high visibility, provide an on-going reminder, and mobilize universal involvement.

- Canadians want new legislation and enforcement of existing legislation in particular to regulate industrial polluters. Industry is beginning to see the public relations benefits of being good environmental citizens. However, the prevailing attitude toward these efforts is one of cynicism. There was support for shutting down plants until they comply with environmental standards, fines that provide an incentive to comply, and even jailing of directors. In large metropolitan centers there was no fear about loss of jobs, but in smaller centers this was a concern.

- Group members called for establishment of a National Environmental Task Force comprised of highly regarded environmental scientists and others to conduct environmental monitoring, get involved in local issues and publish an annual environmental audit which would receive the same kind of high profile coverage as the Auditor General's report.

- They wanted an International Environmental Research Centre within Canada where scientists from around the world could share information so that research is not replicated. Make Canada an international leader on the environment.

- An international agreement must be established that ensures that companies that make modifications to protect the environment are not at a competitive disadvantage due to free trade.

Highlights of In-depth Interviews (Opinion Leaders)

- A timetable with clearcut measurable objectives was consistently called for by leaders of business, labour and the scientific communities.

- ENGOs reacted in a hostile manner when interviews with them were requested because their opinions on what the government should do were clearly expressed in the Greenprint, which they said 28 groups took six months to prepare on their own initiative.

- Business Council on National Issues representative presented his personal view that business had not been adequately consulted for input into the Agenda; that the Business Round Table has no constituency among the Council's members; that business should be a partner in this effort; that if taxes will be involved, business does not want this sprung on them even as a trial balloon; that sustainable development should be defined in that at present it implies a massive shift of wealth to the Third World.

- Canadian 4H Council would put soil and water conservation, clean air and safe use of pesticides and herbicides as priorities for the Agenda. The Canadian Youth Foundation stated that youth organizations do not have a position on the environment because young people do not have a vote.

- Canadian Labour Congress would like a national debate on Zero Emissions; Zero Emissions should be the guiding principle and objective for an environmental strategy. They would like a definition of sustainable development for industrialized as well as non-industrialized countries. The CLC's position is that environmental cleanup creates as many jobs as it costs. Canada should be in the forefront of hydrogen fuel technology. The consultation on the WHMIS legislation with labour, business and provinces should be a model for environmental consultation.

- Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences would like measurable objectives and time frames, such as "by the year 2000 the number of beach closures in urban centers will be reduced by 50 percent"; they would like the federal government to be an example, in requiring all departments to use recycled paper by the year 1995; the National Building Code should be changed to

provide for water saving devices in all new home construction; they would like the federal government to establish a QA/QC program for Canada; a federal department reorganization is needed to provide for one body cutting across all departments; the provisions of the Canada-U.S. International Joint Commission should be implemented on a national basis.

- Representatives of the pulp and paper industry stated that the federal government should set priorities related to what is important to the environment, not priorities related to what is high profile such as dioxins; government should set realistic timetables for industry to comply; government should demonstrate leadership by setting an example within own departments, crown corporations, for priorities and spending to achieve sustainable development; government should do annual environmental audit within its departments as pulp and paper industry does.

- Pulp and paper industry representatives are very concerned that there is no dialogue with the federal government in B.C. resulting in western alienation; a real consultative process is necessary to interface environment and economy; move away from a regulatory stance; set realistic goals; work on educating public; a fundamental change in values is needed.

- Canadian Petroleum Association states that there has been no consultation to date with federal government on environment; a comprehensive consultative process is needed; wants quantifiable indicators and goals worked out with the scientific and economic communities; initiatives have to priced; and the ideal balanced with economic reality; a timetable needs to be established; regulations should not be based on the worst offenders.

SECTION 2.0

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

2.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In preparation for the announcement of its Environment Agenda early in 1990, Environment Canada commissioned qualitative research to evaluate the depth of Canadians' concerns about the environment, their expectations of the Federal Government in dealing with this issue, what trade offs they are prepared to make in order to help protect the environment, and to scope out requirements for quantitative research evaluating Agenda initiatives.

This report presents a detailed analysis of the results of focus groups conducted in eight major centres across Canada, as well as findings of in-depth interviews conducted with industry, science, youth organizations and union leaders.

Under separate cover, recommendations for quantitative research will be presented.

SECTION 3.0

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Focus Groups

The key objectives of the research were as follows:

- to elicit from Canadians their views on what should be included in the Environment Agenda
- to obtain their expectations of the Federal Government in dealing with the environment—what it has achieved to date, and what it could realistically be expected to achieve; as well as what signs would clearly indicate that the government has taken action on the environment.

In addition, the research was directed at:

- assessing current knowledge levels and uncovering the depth of Canadians' concerns about the environment vis-a-vis other issues facing the federal government
- evaluating perceptions of where responsibility rests, both for creating the problem and for solving it
- assessing what changes to their lifestyle Canadians are prepared to make to help protect the environment
- determining what Canadians expect of industry with regard to the environment.

Research objectives for the in-depth interviews were as follows:

- to identify key issues that must be addressed by environmental policy
- to outline initiatives that should be in the Environmental Agenda to deal with each issue
- to outline the role their organization could play in achieving these goals

- to evaluate perceptions of the appropriate role for the Federal Government, as leader, partner or both
- to identify perceived risks and benefits to the organization
- thoughts on "polluter pay" principle and "sustainable development".

METHODOLOGY

Focus Groups

Between November 1 and November 9, 1989, sixteen focus groups were held in 8 centres across Canada, one group comprised of the general public and the other of the "informed and active" public, or those who are more knowledgeable about current events, more articulate and more likely to act on key social issues. The screener used to recruit group members is found in Appendix B. The composition and distribution of the groups was as follows:

COMMUNITIES	GROUP COMPOSITION
Halifax Montreal (French) Joncquieres (French) Toronto Calgary Thunder Bay Saskatoon Vancouver	• two groups per centre • one group-general public • one group-informed and active public. • mix of males and females, distributed across age segments 18-25, 26-45, 45 plus • cross section of higher education and incomes

A copy of the moderator's discussion guide which was used as a starting point in exploring the range of opinion held by group members is found in Appendix A.

SECTION 4.0

DETAILED FINDINGS

4.0 DETAILED FINDINGS

4.1 Focus Groups

4.1.1 Importance of the Environment as an Issue

Group members were asked to identify what they thought were the most important issues facing the federal government today. At the time the groups were conducted in early November, 1989, the two most important issues to group members were "the deficit" and "abortion". Meech Lake was one of the most important issues for Quebec respondents.

The environment was mentioned by every group, but tended not to be top-of-mind, and was usually named third or fourth on the list. Comments similar to the following were heard from group members:

> "I don't think the environment is at a stage where it is a serious personal problem."

After group members named a list of issues and were again asked to select which one issue was most important, the environment moved up in importance and often captured the majority of votes.

The immediacy of economic issues and abortion was, according to group members, created by the media. However, when they had a chance to think about it, they made comments like:

> "There's no sense being alive and having no inflation in a place that's unfit to live." (male respondent)
>
> "Kill the environment and we die with it." (male respondent)

As group members further discussed their concerns, a number of emotions and reactions were elicited:

Personal Powerlessness

> "We feel impotent." (male respondent)
>
> "What can I do as a concerned individual?" (female respondent)

Complacency

> "It's hard to change our ways..I don't think a lot of us really understand how to go about changing things..We need a kick in the pants..lead us through..Maybe have it forced down our throats." (male respondent)
>
> "You go get fast food and you know the boxes are no good but you just go there because it's faster." (male respondent)

Sadness and Guilt

"Our children when they grow up. If we destroy the environment right now, it's going to be a terrible world for them to grow up in." (female respondent)

Fear and Health Concerns

"It's unhealthy...the chemicals that are in our water so we can drink it...you're putting that into your body every day...it's scarey." (female respondent)

"It scares me...building houses on contaminated soil...I wish the government would do something." (female respondent)

Outrage

"Where are we going and what are we giving up to make these technological advancements we are making? Are we willing to throw away our quality of life?" (male respondent)

Loss of Personal Enjoyment

"When I'm ready to enjoy the area at my leisure...it's going to be a wasteland...foam on the water...We lost two trees through acid rain." (female respondent)

4.1.2 Readiness for Action

Although there is no sense of immediate crisis, changes are becoming noticeable. The feeling was that we haven't gone too far, but we've certainly gone far enough.

Changes have become noticeable to group members.

> "The air is changing...it's getting like Toronto...I'm getting migraines...It's a health concern" (female respondent)
>
> "There's a critical mass that's been built up...people are concerned" (male respondent)
>
> "It's not too late...we're a bit late." (male respondent)

4.1.3 The Environment As An Issue

The environment is an issue that is characterized as being complex and somewhat intangible. It has no intrinsic deadlines; however, many individuals believe that failure to deal with the issue could result in dire consequences for the health of individuals and for survival—not only of the species but the planet.

> "The environment is more intangible...you can't express in dollars what the deficit is for the Environment." (male respondent)
>
> "The environment is easier to ignore than something you're confronted with. That's why governments don't make a decision. All these things are subtle changes...a tax you see every day." (male respondent)
>
> "There's a lag factor in pollution...when measurements show ozone has been depleted." (male respondent)
>
> "You don't know what the long-term effects will be of inhaling polluted air over 10 years, 20 years." (male respondent)
>
> "The scientists all have conflicting points of view...We look to the scientists for information." (female respondent)

4.1.4 Concerns With Specific Environment Issues

Air and water quality were given top priority by all of the groups. This was followed by waste disposal, acid rain, the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect, preservation of resources and endangered species and radiation.

There was some regional variation in the importance of various environmental issues. Soil depletion, farm chemicals and the greenhouse effect were mentioned more frequently in Calgary and Saskatoon; Halifax groups placed acid rain higher up on the list. In Quebec, the environment tended to be equated with littering and poor waste management. Surprisingly, in none of the groups were environmental disasters such as oil spills mentioned as a specific concern.

4.1.5 Awareness of Government Action on the Environment

The present government is not thought to be serious about the environment; the environment is not perceived to be an issue of importance to them.

The environment, according to group members, is an issue that has been with us for a long time, perhaps as long as 20 years, when the first anti-littering campaigns were conducted. The perception was that nothing much has been done about the environment since these campaigns.

> "Environment as an issue...has been around a long time. Now everybody's jumping on the bandwagon." (female respondent)

> "We've heard about these things for 20 years. Now they've passed a law that won't be in effect till 1995. Why are they taking so long to do something when they have the knowledge?" (female respondent)

When really pushed, some group members mentioned the acid rain negotiations between Prime Minister Mulroney and President Bush as an example of government achievement on the environment.

The prevailing mood was one of cynicism, and the idea was repeatedly expressed that the proposed Environmental Agenda would in all likelihood be a "smoke and mirrors exercise", and one that would attempt to give the appearance of doing something without really doing anything.

> "Bush and Mulroney are closer to an agreement on acid rain; we'll wait and see what happens". (female respondents)
>
> "Half measures...it's always too little, too late." (male respondent)
>
> "The push for the environment is old news...hype...the federal government will use this as a political thing." (male respondent)
>
> "The federal government is using bandages, giving drought relief...Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta were declared drought areas. This allows the farmer to abuse the land one more year." (male respondent)

There was virtually no awareness of sustainable development. There was also little or no awareness of who is the current Minister or what Environment Canada does, other than weather forecasts.

4.1.6 Perceived Responsibility for Environmental Problem

When asked who is responsible for creating these environmental problems, the first response given most often in the groups is "We are". Group members openly acknowledge that their fast paced, convenience oriented lifestyle, and "the good life" contribute to the problem.

However, they don't hold themselves entirely responsible. In fact they do not know what to do differently, and without this knowledge, they do not accept full responsibility. Because of their feeling of powerlessness, to a certain extent they rationalize their own behaviour and point the finger elsewhere.

> "There are lots of things we don't have control over...Third World countries...the rain forest...it is human nature to want to get ahead." (male respondent)
>
> "Population growth...progress...human nature...peer pressure." (male respondent)
>
> "Advertising saying you have to have this." (female respondent)
>
> "It costs money to change." (female respondent)
>
> "Government...big power brokers allow this to happen...big money...they know it will hurt us." (male respondent)
>
> "Politicians are afraid to do anything; big business backs them." (male respondent)

Groups were unanimous in their feeling that blame can clearly be placed at the feet of the large industrial polluters and weak ineffectual governments that do not have the will to control industry even if the legislation is in place.

4.1.7 Perceived Responsibility for the Solution

Canadians feel that the responsibility for the solution is threefold. It rests not only with the average citizen, but with government and with industry. Although a gradual program was most often mentioned as the way to go, all phases of the plan should involve all three sectors working on the problem at once.

Canadians clearly want the federal government to lead the way on the environment, and even to take some tough action. They want the government to provide them with a strong program on the environment, which would start with the "small, everyday things" such as recycling and buying environmentally friendly products, and move into areas that are more difficult for the average Canadian, such as controls or changes to the use of private automobiles.

Canadians want the government to "get tough" with industrial polluters. They specifically do not want a program that is superficial.

4.1.8. Steps Canadians Are Willing to Take

When asked what they might be willing to do to help save the environment, group members did not volunteer to make major changes to their lifestyle. The greatest resistance to change was with regard to their use of their automobiles.

A minority of group members volunteered to car pool more and use public transit more frequently. However government cuts to Via Rail were thought by group members to be inconsistent with this strategy. City public transit would have to be

greatly improved before it would be a viable option. Our weather conditions are such that the public does not see public transit as a viable option unless it comes virtually to their front door. The concept of paying more at the pump, with revenues generated to go to an environmental fund, received a uniformly negative response from group members, who felt that they were already taxed to the limit, that a more efficient government could find the money in existing tax revenues, and that the revenue would in all likelihood end up in some kind of "slush fund".

When presented with the idea of being able to drive downtown only on alternate days, with the specific days depending on the license plate, group members almost invariably stated that they would try to find some way of "beating the system", for example by buying two different cars with two different kinds of plates.

Surprisingly, the least resistance was to the concept of paying, for example, $1,000 - $2,000 extra for a car that was more efficient environmentally. Although a number of group members felt that they were already doing this, they were on the whole, most willing to consider the idea.

Rather than being further taxed or paying a higher price for cars, several people indicated they felt tax incentives for the purchase of environmentally friendly cars would be more appropriate.

In addition, it was generally believed that we should not have to pay more for environmentally friendly products, and that in fact products that are harmful to the environment should be subject to a surcharge. It is also believed that although

environmentally friendly products are generally more expensive at present, this is in part a marketing scam and when they become more widely available, prices will be forced down.

Things Canadians volunteered to do are the things they are presently doing, only more of the same—recycling garbage and buying environmentally safe products. Some examples volunteered by the groups are reusing shopping bags, starting a compost heap, shopping at stores that have photodegradable bags, using washing soda instead of dish washer detergent, and washing out their cans.

This does not mean that the environment is unimportant to Canadians. As we have seen it is very important , but in the absence of information to the contrary, it does not appear to be a burning issue and in the public's mind there is no evidence that we are on the brink of disaster.

The <u>will to change is there,</u> but the <u>impetus</u> is not. Without the support of various initiatives outlined in the Environmental Agenda, the changes which appear to be necessary are soft changes. As one group member put it "without the rules would you volunteer to pay taxes?"

4.2 The Average Canadian's Environmental Agenda

Canadians across the country were asked to discuss amongst themselves in the focus groups what should be included in a plan or agenda for the Environment to be introduced by the federal government in the new year. They were asked to describe their realistic expectations of the federal government in dealing with the Environment—what they would regard as definite signs that the government is taking action on this issue. The following describes the consensus of their opinions and often heated discussions on the subject:

4.2.1 Tripartite Initiative

There was strong agreement among group members that the plan, to be successful, must be a shared one right from the start. Because the problem is an all-pervasive one, the solution must be shared. Canadians must know that they are not acting in isolation, so that they can have the assurance that their efforts will not be wasted.

Although a graduated program was generally called for, and Canadians do not expect results overnight. They would like government, industry and the average citizen to be actively involved at the beginning and all the way through the program. As one group member put it,

> "It has to be whole spectrum. It has to be the government who is giving leadership. It has to be individual. It has to be big business. It has to be labour. Its got to be all together. We get together."

4.2.2 Education and Communication

The greatest demand is for education on the environment in a mass communications program. Current levels of knowledge about the environment are rudimentary; for example, the greenhouse effect and depletion of the ozone layer are often thought to be the same problem.

Canadians think of the environment as a complex, intangible problem on which they often receive conflicting information. The most frequent example of this provided by group members was the conflicting views on the harmfulness of PCB's.

Canadians are presently involved, in a limited way, in recycling garbage and in buying environmentally safe products. They would like to do more of this as a first step in their efforts to be more environmentally aware and conscientious. They need a lot more information as well as government programs on their day-to-day handling of household and office garbage, as well as in their choice of consumer products. Information is needed, for example, on which products are environmentally harmful and why. What are the alternatives, for example, to double and triple packaging? How does one properly dispose of paint and varsol, turpentine and batteries?

In many cases respondents have so little information that they did not know what questions to ask. As one group member put it;

"We need more information to determine our concerns."

When questioned as to what kind of information is required, their replies focussed on how the information should be presented rather than what kind of information to present.

Simple, Factual, Solution (rather than Problem) Oriented

The environment is perceived to be a complex problem, about which group members repeatedly said they wanted "true facts", and "simple facts". They do not want the scare tactics that would result from focussing mainly on the problem. They want hope, and they want to know what they themselves can do.

Graphic, Visual

Because changes to the environment are subtle and almost intangible, frequent references were made to the need for visuals, for pictures and for proof. The David Suzuki documentary approach was often mentioned.

Repetitive/Awareness

Group members were quick to recognize that new habit formation is at the basis of many of the decisions and activities they would undertake to change to a more environmentally conscious lifestyle. Group members actually stated they would

need continual reminders at the beginning until these new habits had become grooved. The initial change might be painful, but once the habit had been formed, it would be automatic. As one group member put it;

"Habit overcomes the convenience aspect."

Directed at Children

Children are thought to be potentially effective environmental advocates as they have been effective anti-smoking advocates. A number of group members claimed that the pressure exerted on them by their children as a result of what they had learned in school was instrumental in causing them to quit smoking, and that a similar outcome could happen with the environment if the children were provided the information starting in kindergarten.

4.2.3 Convenient Programs

Frequent references were made to the Blue Box system in place in various municipalities as being the ideal program for helping to protect the environment. The necessary vehicle—the box—is provided, which makes it very convenient. It is a program that makes people feel good. Group members felt that they are doing something about the garbage problem, although they are often not entirely certain why they are separating out newspapers and bottles and what is accomplished as a result of doing this. This is a program, group members felt, that should be in place in all communities.

One of the keys to the success of this program is that it is highly visible; the blue boxes are out every week as a weekly reminder. There is a certain element of guilt involved if one chooses not to participate. At the same time, one has the reassurance of knowing that because most people are doing it, the likelihood is greater that some results will actually be achieved. The universal involvement aspect is key to making the average person feel that their own individual efforts will not be futile.

> "You can't look at the macro scale...you feel impotent. You have to look at what you can do as an individual. And if everybody does it, things are going to change. That's the only way you can look at it."

People who had travelled to Europe often mentioned the string bags that are available to grocery shoppers and which people bring to the store with them. Such an item could be similar to the blue box in that it would be provided to shoppers, thus making it convenient. The peer pressure of seeing other people in the store using their string bag would provide the motivation to comply. Such a program would also provide the type of continual reminder that Canadians seem to want.

Canadians want the program to generate a level of enthusiasm. They are willing to be mobilized and led to action. They want goals and targets. They want positive reinforcement.

> "I don't have a clue what to do. Give me a list of 18 things I can do. Even if I did one it's more than what I'm doing now. If everybody just did one."

4.2.4 Legislation and Enforcement

Existing legislation has been inadequate in protecting the environment. Canadians want tougher anti-pollution laws on the books. If legislation is currently in place that could deal with the problem, Canadians want that legislation enforced.

In Quebec, a confrontational stance vis-a-vis heavy polluters was particularly apparent, as was frustration with government inaction. In the rest of the country there was some acknowledgement that industry is starting to become more environmentally conscious. However, there is widespread cynicism about the motives involved.

The example of the Loblaws Green Products program was brought up repeatedly. This was widely felt to be a dishonest program, because it is believed, products which were in existence prior to the program were simply repackaged and the price increased. Other so-called environmentally friendly products were, as it turns out, not so good for the environment. Other Green Products were considered to be of inferior quality and high priced. This is an example that industry cannot be trusted on the environment.

It is clear to group members that the profit motive underlies any environmental initiatives undertaken by industry, even if it involves positive impact on corporate image from environmental initiatives, which ultimately contributes to profit. Group members felt that if it is not profitable to be environmentally conscious, industry will elect not to be.

It is therefore necessary to take tough measures against industry to demonstrate not only to them but to the average Canadian that government is serious about the environment. If more than one industrial polluter were actually shut down as a result of failing to comply, group members felt that the Environmental Agenda would be something more than mere window dressing.

Two considerations were raised by group members, and that is the impact on jobs and the Free Trade considerations. Canadian companies that undertook to make modifications to comply with environmental legislation might be placed at a competitive disadvantage to American companies. This led to the conclusion that an international agreement would be necessary. The impact on jobs of plant closures was a concern in smaller centers which are more heavily reliant on one or two key industries. In Toronto there was an almost cavalier attitude about the loss of jobs, with respondents claiming they could go out and get another job tomorrow.

With regard to the polluter pay principle, Quebeckers in particular are adamantly against this. Quebec groups felt that to tax pollution is to condone it. In other groups, the feeling was expressed that the majority of fines are not large enough to actually discourage the polluting activity, resulting in industry continuing to pollute and simply paying the fine to cover it.

Actually jailing senior executives whose companies continued to pollute was occasionally mentioned as a possibility.

Additionally, group members asked about existing anti-littering bylaws. The fact that these are uniformly ignored were further credence to the notion that the

government is not particularly serious about the environment, and that the environment is not a critical issue. As one group member, in describing the need for legislation, put it;

"We need to be led, strongly."

4.2.5 The Federal Government as an Example

Group members proposed that the government set an example to the rest of Canadians in two specific ways:

- reduce the amount of paper generated by government by 'x' number of tonnes annually, and actually demonstrate to Canadians that they accomplished this
- require government contractors to pass an environmental audit before they are eligible to bid on federal projects

4.2.6 Task Force and Environmental Monitoring

It would be totally unacceptable to Canadians to establish another Royal Commission to study the problem of the environment. However, a clear sign that progress was being made would be the establishment of an independent Task Force. The Task Force would operate at arm's length from the government. It would have the mandate to do such things as:

- Conduct an annual environmental audit and to report to Canadians.

- Conduct environmental monitoring using a number of "measurable, concrete" indicators of progress made, particularly in the areas of the air and water—the two first priorities. This would necessitate some type of numerical measure in a simple form that would be relevant and comprehensible to the average Canadian (Note: recommendations contained in the report of the in-depth interview with the Rawson Academy).

- Become involved in local environmental problems.

Such a group might even be given legal authority to enforce certain recommendations.

The group would be comprised of highly regarded environmental specialists and scientists, "people without an axe to grind", together with regional and possibly local representatives. It was thought that it might be necessary to have a government representative on the Task Force. This should be avoided, or in the alternative made a non-voting chair. The Minister, if he or she were to be on the Task Force, would not lead it.

4.2.7 Research and Development

Group members felt that the Canadian Government should be heavily involved in research and development on the environment and that we should look at the various ways in which technology can be used to improve the environment.

Greater sharing of information between countries was suggested as a way to overcome the situation in which scientists around the world duplicate each other's efforts. It was further suggested that Canada establish an international research centre on the environment in Canada where scientists from around the world could meet and work together.

4.2.8 International Aspects

Because of Free Trade and the potential competitive disadvantages that would accrue to Canadian companies who attempt to implement environmental improvements, an international agreement which would among other things, address this problem, was thought to be necessary. In addition, group members though that a tougher approach with the U.S. on acid rain was necessary.

Additionally, the hope was expressed that Canada would become an international leader on the environment. This seemed in keeping with our vast natural resources. It is an important role of which Canadians could be proud.

Foreign aid to Third World countries to prevent further disasters like the burning of the rain forest in Brazil was also called for by group members.

4.3 Regional Differences

Because of the small sample sizes involved, focus groups are not suitable for determining regional differences in the strength of attitudes or behaviour within a larger, national group. At best, focus groups can point to regional or local issues or phenomena which do not exist in the rest of the country.

To obtain a valid measure of regional variations in attitudes and behaviour, a large scale quantitative study is necessary in which sample sizes regionally are adequate to perform regional analysis.

For example, the broad issues of concern did not appear in the focus groups to vary widely across the country. In every center, Abortion, Meech Lake, the GST and Environment were high on the list of issues. In addition, there appeared to be a great deal of similarity in environmental issues of concern, these being primarily air and water.

Quebec residents in focus groups expressed their concerns with more passion and strength, in addition to reflecting higher levels of distrust of industry and a more militant stance against big business. This might lead to the conclusion that Quebecers are more concerned with the environment. However, quantitative research often shows Quebec residents expressing their opinions more strongly than the rest of Canada. To correct for this their responses have to be standardized in order to determine whether there is a true difference in their level of concern.

Local environmental problems mentioned in various centers were as follows:

- Halifax Harbour
- Pollution to the St. Lawrence in Montreal
- Deforestation and pollution of the Saguenay (by spills and contaminated snow) in Joncquieres
- Toronto Harbour and beaches, storing of garbage in landfill
- Pollution of drinking water and fear of cancer, as a result of pollutions from pulp and paper mills in Thunder Bay, together with concern about reliance on polluters for jobs
- Drought, depletion of the soil, extensive use of herbicides in Saskatoon
- Increased air pollution in Calgary
- Installation of third runway, storage of urban garbage in Vancouver

The Environmental Monitor, Summer, 1989, points to some variance in environmental issues of concern such as the transportation of hazardous waste; the effect of environmental protection on employment in various regions of Canada; local environmental quality compared to other parts of Canada; the state of wildlife populations; fresh water exports; future environmental quality; the environmental performance of government, and other issues.

Such variations, even if statistically significant at the time of the survey, would have to be validated by conducting more than one wave of research, using the identical questions, interviewing and sampling techniques, in order to conclude that there are some real regional differences in attitudes on environmental issues.

In addition, the apparently greater concern of Quebecers noted in the Environmental Monitor should be validated.

4.4 In-depth Interviews

The full complement of interviews that had been scheduled with Canada's leading corporations was not completed. Interviews had to be cancelled at the time the project was halted; however representatives of Proctor and Gamble, IBM and Canadian Tire, in particular, indicated a keen interest in participating in this study should it be re-initiated.

4.4.1 Notes From An Interview With Mr. Don Gamble, Executive Director, Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences

The Government must have the courage to take clearly defined and innovative steps in the new Environmental Agenda. Unfortunately, all the evidence to date suggests that the present bureaucratic system within Environment Canada and perhaps elsewhere in Government is not conducive to generating innovation. The following are illustrative of the kinds of things that should be contained in the Agenda:

Measurable Objectives and Time Frames

If the Agenda is to be meaningful, it needs to contain specific commitments for measurable results to be achieved within certain time frames. Canadians would not be critical of a Minister who set goals and tried to achieve them if, in the end the actual results fell short. Canadians cannot think highly of a Minister who does

not set goals for fear of failure. We need a five year plan with short-term and long-term objectives. Obviously some of these objectives should be achieved just prior to the next election.

Federal Government's Role

The government has four distinct roles when it comes to the Environment:

- Leader
- Partner
- Catalyst
- and/or Partner

In each part of the Environmental Agenda government has to be clear about which role it is playing, to avoid the situation in which it pretends to do something it is not empowered to do which would detract from the credibility of the document or muddy the communication. The government should take a leadership role in areas where it has the power to act unilaterally; in areas where legislation is not in place, it can be the catalyst or assume a partnership role.

The government can lead intellectually when it can't act unilaterally.

Federal Government Sets an Example - a Simple Elegant Step

A) Recycling

The federal government can provide leadership in its procurement practices where again, measurable objectives could be set; for example, by the year 1995, all stationery, envelopes and other paper used by federal government departments will be made of recycled paper. The Department of Supply and Services could require all contractors by the year 1993 to submit their reports on recycled paper and to sign off on their contracts with DSS to that effect. For every tonne of recycled paper that we use, we save 17 trees; we use 58% less water to make the paper, 64% less energy; 75% less air pollution is produced; and 35% less water pollution; with the reduced water pollution we are addressing three items that are on the CEPA priority substances list.

By the federal government setting an example, they are taking a simple, elegant step that is in keeping with the philosophy of the present government. We nudge the marketplace in a certain direction and allow them time to respond. The government would by this initiative create an entirely new market demand, and at the same time make recycled paper affordable. It is presently no more expensive to produce but expensive because there is so little demand for it. The forestry industry should not object to this if they are given the time to adjust.

B) National Building Code

Where the government does not have the legislative power, it can be the catalyst. In many cased, the provinces will follow. For example, the National Building Code should be changed to provide for water saving devices in all new home construction. Again, water saving devices are no more expensive once the market has been expanded. The government can work with the National Research Council to do this, and the provinces will follow.

C) Swimmable Beaches

Canadians have a right to swimmable beaches and a right to eat fish and wildlife without restrictions. The government should set the objective that by the year 2000 the number of beach closures in urban areas in Canada will be cut by 50 percent.

The federal government should then provide the science and technology to the provinces and municipalities to help them bring these changes about. Setting objectives and offering help to the municipalities would put them under tremendous political pressure to comply.

D) QA/QC Program

The government should act to establish a Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) program for Canada. As more environmental testing moves over to the private sector from government labs, federal (CEPA) and provincial (e.g. MISA) program requirements are in danger of becoming meaningless because the same sample can be sent to two different labs and two different answers result. The federal government should be the driving force which would establish a program to ensure that standards are consistently met by way of inter-laboratory comparisons; by government (federal and provincial), private sector and other laboratories working together to ensure quality control and quality assurance. The government would then only accept results from certified labs. The partnership approach could be used rather than a policing approach. By taking the lead, the federal government could be seen to be the hero in this situation. The first steps have already been sponsored by the Burlington lab of Environment Canada. The Environmental strategy can seize this initiative and make it work for all Canadians. This kind of program would appeal to the informed environmental community in Canada and would be particularly appealing to the provinces.

Inter-Departmental Organization

The present organization of government does not provide a focussed approach for many of the most important environmental problems. For example, water is presently being handled by various departments, including Fisheries and Oceans, Parks Canada and Environment Canada. It is further complicated by provincial jurisdictions. Fisheries and Oceans focuses its activities on ocean waters; fresh

water ecosystems get a short shrift. This type of compartmentalization has little relevance to the way the resource is actually used or experienced by the Canadian public. We need an ecosystems approach whereby one body cuts across all departments.

Canada - U.S. International Joint Commission

The 1987 Protocol amending the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement first signed in 1972 and updated in 1978 provides for a Canada-U.S. commitment to things such as an ecosystems approach and zero discharge of persistent toxic chemicals into the Great Lakes waterways. The agreement also commits Canada to other important measures to protect beneficial uses. It is only a matter of time, perhaps a year at most, before the rest of the country realizes that the standards that apply to them are not as stringent as those applying to the Great Lakes. At that time there will be a demand for a national program. The government should preempt this and take a proactive stance by implementing the provisions of the Agreement on a national basis.

Dislocations

If these things are implemented, there will be some market dislocations, but if things continue as they are we will pay for it anyway. For example, mothers around the Great Lakes are already found to have levels of toxins in their breast milk which are above acceptable standards for feeding their babies. A recent study in Michigan shows that pollution loadings in women are already resulting in babies with a lower birth weight and size and lower IQ's—all now directly related to

pollution. Dislocations have been managed before. We can manage market dislocations where there is a shift in technology. The environmental strategy should offer to help industry through this.

> "When people start to realize what is happening, particularly with things like persistent toxic substances, it won't be the job they are going to be worried about. They will see that their health and that of their children is threatened. We are at a point very analogous to the declaration of a war, a comparison that has already been made by the Speaker of the House of Commons, and the Brundtland Commission. Mustering our resources to address the global and national threat that we have created must be an overarching priority".

4.4.2 Notes From An Interview With Business Council On National Issues, November 27, 1989

The Business Council on National Issues has established a Task Force on the Environment. Its objectives at the present time are to:

- develop a handbook of "Best Practices" that will draw upon the management environmental success already achieved by Canadian business
- establishment of national environmental awards program
- enlist CEO's and senior executives to speak on the environment to raise the profile of environmental issues
- sponsor, with the government of the Netherlands, a one day seminar on environmental planning
- production of an environmental directory, a hard copy and on-line reference to all those active involved in the environmental area

The understanding is that the Environmental Agenda will be released as a budget paper in the Spring.

The Business Council was concerned that it had not be consulted with to make input to the Agenda. In response to some pressure from member companies, the President met with the ADM from Environment. The consultation with the Business Round Table has not been effective because it doesn't really have the constituency to speak for the Business Council's members.

The Business Council does not want the kind of mistakes that were made with GST to be repeated. Their position is "Let us know what is coming so that we can work together with the Government."

For example, the Minister's recent testimony to the Commons Committee that he would like the legislative authority and the means to do what is required on the Environment implies that some type of tax measures will be involved. If this is the case, the Business Council would not want this to be sprung on them, even as a trial balloon.

The Agenda has to define what it means by "sustainable development", as the Government is saying that it fully supports "sustainable development." It doesn't mean anything unless we put it in context. Business may misinterpret this as meaning that we preserve the status quo and that it is a better alternative than the no growth position of the sixties and seventies, and may mistakenly support the position.

What it may imply is not so much a business-government polarization as a political and economic polarization between western nations and the Third World. If it means a commitment to raising the environmental standards of the Third World, this will of necessity entail a degradation of Canadians' "lifestyle"—including less convenience and less consumption of energy.

The Brundtland Report would indicate that "sustainable development" means a massive transfer of wealth to the Third World. You will not find a political party that will run on this platform. It is misleading not to clearly define "sustainable development." The Third World will be making their voices heard at the Washington Conference and other conferences, and people will begin to understand what is entailed. People are willing to pay a bit more for environmentally safe products, but when push comes to shove, if a carbon tax on gas means they cannot take their car to the cottage as often, they will fight that.

"Sustainable development" involves more that a shift in technology. It means a fundamental change to our lifestyles and corporate values. The question is do we have the kind of leadership to make such major changes stick. If we are going to have any kind of success at all it has to be in partnership with business. Business has not been consulted on the environment because they are perceived as the bad guys and not really as part of the solution. Business is part of the solution. Industrial processes are causing the problem, and business has the power to change those processes or to tell government what is in the realm of the possible. Business can muster the support of shareholders and employees.

Other issues that the Agenda has to address are global warming, a real problem and ozone depletion, a related problem. As well, toxins in minute quantities have now been shown to accumulate. The pulp and paper industry now has its dioxin and feran emissions under control, but the shell fishery closings out West are the result of emissions that occurred ten years ago. Are the minute emissions happening today going to be proven dangerous in the future? We need more research and development.

Then you have an economic problem. It is going to take massive capital investment to make the necessary changes. How much will government require of industry and how much will industry do on their own. We have to keep industry viable internationally. The coal situation in China is lower down on our list of priorities given what we face at home, however, we need international conferences for each of the toxic substances and environmental context; we want to be seen as leaders but not too far ahead of the pack.

Massive education is required, to be sponsored by business, government, environmental organizations, and starting in the public schools.

There is the constitutional issue. There will be a struggle between the federal government and the provinces because this is a politically sexy issue. Each minister will want his full share. The provinces want the federal government to simply set national standards and come up with the money, and leave the rest to the provinces.

Although we will have to deal with the potential problems of loss of jobs and international competitiveness, there are opportunities for Canadian business to develop environmental technologies. The Business Council has prepared a proposal for a Canadian Environmental Trust under which Canadian companies would donate or sell the license to international proprietary rights to environmental technology to the Trust to be provided to underdeveloped countries. The Trust would maintain a portfolio of technologies to be matched to the requirements of these countries.

There is a great deal of interest among CEO's of the Business Council's member companies in the environment, because it is beginning to impact on their bottom lines, and they realize that their future profitability may depend to a certain extent on how well they manage environmental issues. The pulp and paper industry has long been interested, but is is even extending down to the service industries such as the banks who produce tremendous amounts of paper.

The Business Council would like to see the federal government take the lead on the environment. There are problems with it, however. The solutions are not politically attractive, and there is the constitutional problem. How does the federal government come down hard on the pulp and paper industry in Northern Alberta?

4.4.3 Notes from an Interview with Betsy Clarke, The Canadian 4H Council, November 27, 1989

4H is not issued oriented. They focus on leadership, training and development of the individual 4H member. They are apolitical, although they got involved in the child sexual abuse issues. Their priorities for the Environmental Agenda would be:

- Soil and Water Conservation
- Clean Air
- Safe use of Pesticides and Herbicides

They would like to meet with Lucien Bouchard in 1991 if he is still minister because they will be developing case studies in which they come with up with a strategy for dealing with various environmental issues. The kids intend to present their strategies to Mazankowsky, if he is still Minister in charge of Agriculture.

They have a lot of dedicated corporate sponsors like the chemical companies who influence the kids future buying habits. For example, the banks think that if you don't get them young you don't get them. Politicians do not think that way.

The government does not listen to young people because they don't have a vote.

They just finished a National 4H conference. They asked the kids in workshops what in the next ten years would be the biggest issue facing them. The first was career, the second, the environment. These kids are very well informed, and know all about Hlar and other chemicals.

After the National 4H Council in Washington, where kids were divided into working groups and came up with recommendations, they were told their views would be made known to the decision makers on Capitol Hill; however, the reality is that if it fits into the political agenda, their views are heard; otherwise, they are ignored.

4.4.4 Notes from Interview with David Bennett, Secretary, Canadian Labour Congress Environmental Committee

The new Environmental Agenda should provide for the following:

We need leadership from the Federal Government; we also need a national debate on Zero Emissions. A Zero Emissions philosophy should be established as a guiding principle and an objective for an environmental strategy. The only exceptions to this would be carbon dioxide, heat and contained solid waste. Industrial processes cannot avoid some solid waste. When it becomes impossible top reach absolute Zero Emissions, we need public consultation as to whether this level of pollution will be acceptable. Unless Zero Emissions becomes the guiding principle, the toxic burden of the earth will increase because the present annual rate of pollution does not get dissipated.

A national strategy involving a total clean-up campaign with specific objectives and deadlines attached to these objectives. Since the 1960's the pollution which was taking place in the Great Lakes has been contained in that it has not increased; however, this is inadequate.

The environment has to be made a national priority. Up until now the accumulation of wealth and industry has taken precedence.

The Agenda should clearly define what lies within federal and what lies within provincial jurisdictions. Can the federal government take a strong stance in matters of provincial jurisdiction such as the destruction of the last remaining forest in Alberta. The federal government back away from any confrontation with the provinces on equivalent environmental standards or other environmental issues.

We need international agreements defining tolerance levels from all nations. If we cannot get this in the short term, we need to go it alone. We cannot delay due to lack of international agreements.

We need to define sustainable development for an industrialized nation. The Brundtland Report focussed on non-industrialized countries. People are starting to think about the notion of sustainable development for developed countries. For example, is it moral to buy up whole sections of forest as a compensation ratio for increased levels of CO^2.

Environmental clean-up creates as many jobs as it costs. We have to develop an industrial strategy together with a national strategy for the environment. Our present industrial structure is insufficient to sustain wealth and maintain full employment.

We have to plan for transition to a viable industrial structure which is at the same time environmentally sound. Environmental cleanup will affect particular groups of workers in particular industries. We have to compensate and retrain these workers. The overall workforce need not suffer.

Canada should be in the forefront of hydrogen fuel technology, which theoretically allows us to do everything we can do with electricity or gasoline and its only byproducts are heat and water.

The federal government has the major responsibility for the environment. We cannot rely on scientists, who will always find reasons for not doing anything. The Reagan philosophy on acid rain is a case in point, where nothing was done until the effects of acid rain were studied to see whether there was a tolerance level. The net result was increased damage to the environment at enormous cost.

The Canadian Chemical Producers Association believes in setting acceptable limits for pollution; this is where the CLC parts company with CCPA. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce wants to rely on market forces to clean up the environment. The CLC does not rule out market forces, but believes the best way to clean up the environment is effective regulation. There is extreme reluctance on the part of business to accept regulations. In many cases what is coming out of the business community is that they take pollution seriously, but that they don't want to use all the weapons in their arsenol for cleaning up the environment because of what they call free enterprise.

The CLC would want proper consultation before regulations are put in place and would want regulation that is needed, not for the sake of imposing regulation, and regulation that is enforced. The basic regulatory framework was set up after the Second World War but it is not used effectively enough because there is no plan or strategy.

The government has been committed to genuine consultation in the area of workplace health and safety in which there was consultation on the WHMIS legislation with labour, business and the provinces that was very successful and could to a certain extent be used as a model. Ninety percent of what the public wanted found its way into the legislation. There was a provincial and a federal dimension to this.

Part of the problem is that it is unclear whose agenda will be put forward, that of the politicians, that of the bureaucrat, or the general public. There is a lot of unnecessary interference from government lawyers, even though on paper we have provided for an effective consultation mechanism.

The national strategy needs to be done as a matter of urgency; otherwise, some environmental damage will become irreversible. The idea of deadlines is essential.

4.4.5 Notes from an Interview with Canadian Petroleum Association

The Canadian petroleum Association would like an orderly, comprehensive consultative process with the Federal Government on environment. However, in their opinion this consultation has not taken place. To the CPA, the process is simply seen as "25 people in Ottawa putting together the Agenda in isolation".

CPA would like to have an inventory of quantifiable measures and environmental indicators worked out by the scientific and economic community. These indicators should enable us to monitor environmental progress and to make comparisons, for example, on a regional or industry basis.

They would like a systematic, sector-by-sector assessment of geographical impact, followed by an analysis of implications on an industry-by-industry basis. The ideal should be balanced with the economic reality, and the large menu of environmental issues should be priced.

Objectives and standards should be established, with their attendant costs. All affected industries should be involved in a complete environmental cleanup, as opposed to focussing on one industry.

There should be a 10-year time span to turn the problem around, 15 years to see progress, and a 25-year deadline.

The Agenda should be process oriented and the end result of negotiations and a give-and-take process between industry, government and science. Fear tactics should not be used. Enforcement is necessary, but regulations should not be based on the worst offender.

There should be a willingness to assist in funding of developing countries technology so that they do not repeat the same environmental mistakes that developed countries have made.

4.4.6 Notes from two Interviews with Representatives of the Pulp and Paper Industry

The pulp and paper industry has some serious concerns about the type of leadership being shown by Ottawa. The Federal Government needs to develop the courage to take a stand with regard to scare mongers.

The Federal Government should establish environmental priorities according to what is truly important rather than what is high profile at the moment, such as the dioxin issue. Realistic timetables should be established.

They see little or no dialogue with the Federal Government taking place in British Columbia, and this had led to a feeling of Western alienation. 'Alberta and British Columbia are being used as whipping boys' on the environmental issue. The

Federal Government does not take a similar stand in Quebec. They have focussed most of the attention on the dioxin issues in British Columbia. When two percent of pollution is coming from the mills and 98% from municipal incinerators, why focus entirely on the mills. The Federal Government should keep politics out of its environmental initiatives.

Environment Canada Should not put any surprises in the new Environmental Agenda. What appears in the Agenda should be the result of consultation with industry. They should use their informal network to achieve this.

Given the track record of the Federal Government and the way they spring things on us, all we can expect from them is to get screwed again. We are concerned that the new Environmental Agenda will be another disaster like the National Energy Program.

The Federal Government will probably set a five year time span; this may not be enough time for the pulp and paper industry. The bureaucracy does not have the expertise to make the correct decisions. They have to be able to assess the implications of any environmental initiatives. We do not have the confidence that we can deal with the complexity of the issue.

In order to get this confidence, we would need some indication of a more serious level of senior level involvement from the various government departments and very senior level industry involvement.

There are some genuine steps the pulp and paper industry has to take to clean up its mills, and the government has every right to regulate the industry and to enforce these regulations. But as long as there are realistic policies and programs in place, we can work it out together. We would resist any regulation of the marketplace.

Some of the cross jurisdictional problems with the various governments should be removed.

The Federal Government should set an example within its own departments and crown corporations, and show us how it is going to formulate policies, allocate resources and grants to create sustainable development. At present, the government has established regulations which exempt their own crown corporations.

Rather than focussing entirely on a regulatory stance, the government should be spending its money educating the public. In order to achieve sustainable development, we need to educate all segments of society from the kitchen to the boardroom. A fundamental change in the present value system is needed.

The Environmental Agenda should be similar to a Participation program. Realistic goals, challenges and targets should be set. Various industries and researchers that have developed innovative programs for sustainable development should be identified. Success stories should be highlighted, and enthusiasm generated.

People will not change because of rules and regulations; they need to be motivated and given positive reinforcement. Tell people that there is a role everyone can play, and we can manage the issue if we work together. Get away from doom and gloom. We can change public perceptions and let people see that something positive is happening.

CAVEAT

The purpose of these focus groups was to provide an indication of the depth of opinion and beliefs which were previously identified in quantitative studies, as well as to identify new issues related to the environmental agenda. The results of focus group research should be viewed as directional only.

The new issues identified by this research, particularly in the area of Agenda items and environmental tradeoffs Canadians are willing to make, may require further quantification, as outlined under separate cover.

The results of in-depth interviews conducted for this project represent the views of the respective individuals and organizations interviewed. The Business Council on National Issues, the Canadian Labour Congress and the Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences reviewed and approved the content of interviews reported herein.

APPENDIX 'A'

MODERATOR'S DISCUSSION GUIDES

DISCUSSION GUIDE

1.0 INTRODUCTION - (5 minutes)

- Introduce Thompson Lightstone
- Outline purpose of the group discussion
- Participant introductions

2.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT - (15 minutes)

- What do you think are the most important issues facing the federal government today? (Can be a written exercise).
  - What about the environment? First, what do you mean when you say environment? When you think of environment do you mainly think of, the air and the water, or do you think of people when you think of environment?
  - There are some people we talk to who think that if nothing is done about the environment, things will be pretty much as they are today, slightly worse but nothing noticeable. What do you think?
  - When it comes to the environment, what specifically are you worried about? Why do you say that?
  - What do you see as the impact on (on your family) personally?
  - Looking at your list of issues, how do environmental problems affect you differently than, for example, employment problems? (Probe: immediacy of problem and perceived life/death/health threat)
- What do you see as the major cause behind these environmental problems?
  - Who/What is responsible for causing these problems?
  - To what extent do you see yourself as contributing to these problems?

    (Are you and I polluters)

- Are you aware of the term Global Warming?
  - What causes it?
  - Is it a good or bad thing?
- What environmental issues/problems require the most immediate attention and why?
  - What solutions can you envision?
- Do you have enough information to make informed choices about the environment? What information is lacking?

3.0 PERCEIVED LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY - (40 minutes)

- Whose responsibility is it to tackle these problems/concerns?
  - What are the perceived roles of:
  - government, which levels of government?
  - industry
  - you as an individual; can one person make a difference?
- How important to the government is the environment compared to other issues?
- Looking at each of your environmental concerns separately, what are your expectations of government in general, and of the federal government in particular.
- What is the very least you would expect the federal government to do to manage (issue) in the next year? Five years? What is the most the federal government could accomplish?
- Do you expect the government to eliminate the problem entirely or just make improvements?
- What 'signs' must you see to convince you that something is being done? ie. what are the 'signals' of progress?
- What does the government have to do to convince you they are taking a "lead" position in environmental planning and management?
- The federal government has added decision making structures that take the environment into account. Do you think this will make a difference? Is this important to you?

4.0 ACCEPTABLE TRADE-OFFS - (30 minutes)

- Is it possible to make improvements to the environment without making personal sacrifices? Can we rely solely on government and business to look after it?
- What changes to your lifestyle are you willing to make in order to alleviate/eliminate the problem?
  - What sacrifices, if any, are you willing to make?
  - Would you pay more for food grown without pesticides?
  - Would you be willing to pay $50-$100 more per month to have products packaged in an environmentally friendly way?
  - Would you buy more energy efficient cars at a higher cost?
  - If gasoline became a lot more expensive in order to discourage driving (which contributes to the green house effect) would you pay the extra and drive as much or do something else?
  - What about bringing your car to the city only on certain days?
  - What would make you stop driving your car to work/into the city/to the corner store (what has to be done to discourage you?)
- Would you make changes to your lifestyle without really knowing what improvements will result? Would you have to know everyone else was doing it at the same time?
- Is it government's role to tell people what lifestyle changes to make to improve the environment or will people make these changes on their own? Is changing prices enough to change behaviour or does government have to impose changes.
- Should gov't be the stimulus for change, or just leave it up to the Market-place (LEADERSHIP ROLE)?
- How far must industry go to accommodate your concerns? And are you willing to share the cost?
- Should industrial polluters be taxed or fined?
- Should products that pollute cost more?

5.0 ACCEPTANCE OF "SUCCESS" STORIES - (15 minutes)

- What federal government environment "success" stories are you aware of?
- What about Environment Canada success stories? (Is Environment Canada seen as a different entity)
- In what areas (air/water/toxic waste/wildlife) has the government done a good job in protecting the environment?
- Where has the government done a poor job?
- What is the role of science in relation to the environment? What should scientists be doing? Should the government be training more of these people?
- Did you know that air quality in major Canadian cities has improved 40 to 60 percent since 1964? How do you respond to that?
- Have you heard of sustainable development? What does it mean to you? Is it possible to have sustainable development (economic growth without damaging the environment/depleting all resources)?

If we have time, as it comes up, pursue it.

- Does the national parks system have anything to do with protecting the environment? (Examples of good environmental management).
- Is there an environmental problem in the Canadian Arctic?
- Is global warming a bad thing in Canada? What causes it? Is there a connection between ozone and the greenhouse effect? Should we use more nuclear energy if it decreases the greenhouse effect?
- How would you respond to the concept of a government environmental watchdog or ombudsman? What should this person do.

6.0 ACCEPTANCE OF MESSAGE (PROCESS EQUALS SUBSTANCE) - (15 minutes)

(Opportunity to test various hypothetical messages for credibility, relevance, and impact.)

APPENDIX 'B'

FOCUS GROUP

RECRUITMENT SCREENER

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
TL# 24389

THOMPSON LIGHTSTONE
& COMPANY LIMITED

SCREENER

Good _____! I am _____ of Thompson Lightstone and Company Limited. We are conducting a short survey today and would like your help.

1. For this survey I can speak to only one person in your household. Could I please speak to the person who is 18 years of age or older and whose birthday comes soonest after today's date?

REINTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY — Yes ---------- 1

ARRANGE CALL-BACK — No ---------- 2

2a) We are interested in knowing the types of activities you are involved in. I am going to read you a list of different activities. For each one, please tell me whether or not you have participated in or been involved in each activity in the PAST YEAR. In the past year have you personally.....

ROTATE		YES	NO
[ ]	written a letter to a magazine or newspaper editor	1	2
[ ]	written a government official at the local, provincial or federal level	1	2
[ ]	been active in a rate-payers	1	2
[ ]	been active in a Parent/Teacher Association	1	2
[ ]	been active in a Political party	1	2
[ ]	volunteered as a canvasser for a political party, health organization or community or youth program	1	2

2b) Which of the following magazines or newspapers, if any, do you read regularly. By regularly, I mean, you read every issue or nearly every issue [READ LIST ACCORDING TO THE ROTATION AND RECORD A YES OR NO FOR EACH]

ROTATE MAGAZINES		YES	NO
[ ]	Time	1	2
[ ]	Maclean's	1	2
[ ]	Harrowsmith	1	2
[ ]	Business Week	1	2
[ ]	Fortune	1	2
[ ]	Saturday Night	1	2
[ ]	Canadian Business	1	2
[ ]	Financial Post Moneywise	1	2
NEWSPAPERS			
[ ]	Globe and Mail	1	2
[ ]	Financial Post	1	2
MONTREAL ONLY			
[ ]	GAZETTE	1	2

RESPONDENT MUST PARTICIPATE IN TWO ACTIVITIES LISTED IN Q.2a AND OR REGULARLY READ TWO OR MORE MAGAZINES OR NEWSPAPER LISTED IN Q. 2b TO CONTINUE. IF NOT, TERMINATE

3. What is the last level of education you completed? Would it be..... [READ LIST]

TERMINATE WITH THANKS

- Some grade school ---------- 1
- Complete grade school ---------- 2
- Some high school ---------- 3
- Completed high school ---------- 4
- Some college/university ---------- 5
- Complete college/university ------- 6
- Post graduate studies ---------- 7
- Other [SPECIFY] _____

4. Please tell me your household income before taxes for 1988. Was it.....

TERMINATE WITH THANKS

- Under $10,000 ---------- 1
- $10,000 to under $20,000 ---------- 2
- $20,000 to under $30,000 ---------- 3
- $30,000 to under $50,000 ---------- 4
- $50,000 to under $70,000 ---------- 5
- $70,000 or more ---------- 6

5a) Are you currently employed outside the home?

- Yes ---------- 1
- No ---------- 2 → TERMINATE WITH THANKS

5b) Is that full-time (30 hours a week or more) or part-time?

- Full-time ---------- 1
- Part-time ---------- 2

5c) What is your occupation? That is what type of job do you do and what type of company do you work for?

JOB: _____ COMPANY: _____

6. Please tell me in which of the following groups you belong. [READ LIST]

- Under 18 ---------- X → TERMINATE
- 18 to 24 ---------- 1
- 25 to 34 ---------- 2
- 35 to 44 ---------- 3
- 45 to 54 ---------- 4
- 55 to 64 ---------- 5
- Over 70 years ---------- 6 → TERMINATE

7. Record sex:

- Male ---------- 1
- Female ---------- 2

8. We are interested in speaking to people such as yourself who are involved in their community. We are holding a group discussion with people like yourself to discuss a number of interesting issues.

These discussions will be taking place on:

_____ at 8:00PM

_____ at 8:00PM

at: Thompson Lightstone

1027 Yonge St. Suite 100 Toronto

Refreshments will be served and you will receive $30.00 as and expression of our thankfulness for your participation. For which discussion group can I put you down.

9. Complete all information on front page and thank respondent for his/her co-operation. [MAKE SURE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN RELAYED TO RESPONDENT]

- DATE/TIME
- LOCATION
- INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING HOW TO GET TO YOUR OFFICE
- TELEPHONE NUMBER IF FOR SOME REASON THEY ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THE GROUP
- COMPANY NAME (TL & C)
- EMPHASIZE IMPORTANCE OF PROMPTNESS
- APPROXIMATE LENGTH OF GROUP DISCUSSION 2 HOURS